



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

county clerk. The omission was not discovered until the time fixed by law for filing such certificate had expired, and authority to then file an amended certificate including plaintiff's name was denied by the clerk, and his action upheld by the Court of Appeals in the case of *Brodie v. Hook*, 135 Kentucky, 87, 121 Southwestern Reporter, 979. In the autumn of 1913 plaintiff instituted the present action against the chairman and secretary of the convention, alleging that the failure to include plaintiff's name in the certificate of nominations was due to their negligence, and that he was thereby deprived of the emoluments of the office to which he alleged he would have been elected, as the other candidates of his party were successful at the election. Defendants demurred to the petition and the demurrer was sustained by the lower court. The Court of Appeals, in affirming the action of the lower court, quotes from the statutes bearing on the subject, and holds that the primary duty of filing a certificate devolved on plaintiff himself, and that, if defendants agreed to attend to it, they acted merely as his agents without compensation, and would not be held liable for an inadvertence which he should have discovered.

---

### MISCELLANY.

---

**Free Legal Aid.**—A new departure has been made in the law courts of England by which free legal service is provided for poor litigants. Access to the English courts has hitherto been practically denied to poor people, owing to the high scale of legal fees. A department of the courts has now been established where poor people can go directly without consulting a lawyer and present their grievances. If these are decided to be real and well founded from a legal point of view the government will undertake to carry their cases through and the expense will be paid from the public funds. Solicitors and barristers who are willing to take up these matters will enroll their names with the department, and cases will be allotted to them in court. No fees will be asked of the litigants, who will thus be placed on equality with the well-to-do in their ability to secure justice.

In the United States, by reason of the prevalent practice among lawyers to take cases upon speculation, the condition of the poor is not so bad as it has been in England in the matter of obtaining legal redress. Nevertheless, even in this country, the high cost of litigation has hampered, if not absolutely prevented, many people of small means from seeking justice in the courts. This condition has been somewhat ameliorated by the legal aid societies of one kind

and another which have been organized in many of the large centres for the purpose of assisting the poor who are unable to employ counsel. A unique scheme of this kind prevails in the city of New York. Well-known lawyers and law firms of that city joined forces with the Legal Aid Society and effected an arrangement by which they become retaining members of the society. Under this arrangement the attorney, instead of doing the work of the poor for nothing as it comes his way, makes a contribution each year as a retaining member of the Legal Aid Society. At the same time he gives the benefit of his advice, when occasion demands, to the society and thus systemizes what charity work he does. Lawyers to become retaining members pay \$50 a year if they have been practicing for fifteen years, and \$25 if for a shorter period. The new arrangement, it appears, has already been of great value in furthering the work of the society, and is bringing the legal profession into touch with the organization to a remarkable degree. In the city of St. Louis the Director of Public Welfare is planning to submit to the new board of aldermen, to be elected next April, an ordinance providing for a free legal aid bureau, with a staff of twenty-five young lawyers who, under the supervision of two capable attorneys of long practice, will try lawsuits for residents of St. Louis who are without means to prosecute their cases. It is thought that many young lawyers, just beginning to practice, will be glad of the chance to have the practical experience in court afforded by the proposed free bureau in the handling of cases of merit.

At first thought it might seem that free legal bureaus would unfairly encroach on the business of the lawyers. Much of the work of such bureaus, however, would be of a kind that most lawyers can profitably dispense with. The existence of these agencies, moreover, would relieve the lawyers of a large amount of charity work which the obligations of their profession now impose upon them. In any case free legal aid to the deserving poor appears to be in the line of progress and social betterment. It will be a step toward a more ideal administration of the law when justice shall not wait upon the longest purse but will be melted out with an even hand to rich and poor alike.—Law Notes.

---

**The Juridical Position of Egypt.**—The establishment of the English Protectorate over Egypt, and the abrogation of the Ottoman suzerainty, regularise a situation which for over thirty years has been a judicial anomaly. Since the military occupation in 1883, England has been the virtual controller of the country, but in law Egypt has remained an autonomous province of the Ottoman Empire; her subjects have been Ottoman; her legal and judicial sys-

tem has been complicated by the Capitulations conceded to Christian Powers by Turkish Sultans; her legislative and taxing powers over foreigners resident in her borders have been gravely restricted by the same fetters; and her progress, remarkable as it is, has been crippled by the fiction of Turkish overlordship, with the consequential European immunities. During recent years, indeed, the vassalage has been reduced to very low terms in regard to international relations. In the Crimean War Egypt duly sent her contingent to help the suzerain Power; in the Turco-Greek war of 1897 she contented herself with withdrawing the *exequaturs* of the Greek consuls, and took no part in the fighting; in the Tripoli and Balkan wars she was strictly neutral, and enforced punctiliously against Turkey the respect due to her neutrality. At the outbreak of the present war she issued a statement as to her relations with Germany and Austria, which involved her in a state of war with those countries, by interdicting all intercourse between her inhabitants and those of the enemy countries, and by permitting acts of belligerent capture in her territorial waters and ports. Thus Egypt had in practice achieved the right to pursue her own policy of peace and war, independently of the suzerain Power, before the struggle began between that Power and England. It then, however, clearly became necessary to cut the Gordian knot of fact and fiction, and the proclamation of the Protectorate has put on a rational basis what was becoming a farcical situation. Egyptians become members of a separate nationality under the protection of His Majesty's Government, wherever they may be; the responsibility of the real protector is made explicit; the impossible tie with the nominal suzerain is severed. But what is of more importance than the immediate regularisation of the position in war is the ultimate change in the status of Egypt in peace in her relations with other Powers. The Capitulations and all the anomalous immunities which foreigners enjoy under them, and which hamper the good administration of the proper legal development of the country, will now be swept away, or so revised as to offer no obstacle to uniform legislation and a uniform judiciary. British justice will be the guarantee of public and private security, as in the rest of the British Empire. The rearrangement of the Courts is to be left till the end of the war, but in the meantime another notable opportunity is afforded to the English jurists to frame a scheme of laws—a new *jus gentium*—which shall take the place of the present multiplicity of legal systems.—*London Law Journal*.